REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the Office Action dated April 28, 2008, and completion of the personal interview of June 11, 2008. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and summarized herein. The Examiner's withdrawal of the finality of the previous Office Action is noted with appreciation. Claims 1, 3-5, 13-16, 18-20, and 28-30 are currently pending, although the instant office action lists the pending claims as 1-5, 13-16, 18-20, and 28-30. Please note that claim 2 has been canceled in a prior amendment.

Claims 1, 3-5, 16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0038958 to Salgado et al. (*hereinafter*, "Salgado") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,606,649 to Tai (*hereinafter*, "Tai"). Claims 13-15 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado and Tai, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,586,242 to McQueen, III et al. (*hereinafter*, "McQueen"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The subject application is directed to a system and method for managing multiple format fonts in an image generating device. A typical printer renders an image by generating a bitmapped output corresponding to encoded data. This bitmapped output is transferred to a medium, such a paper, and forms a printer output. Text-based electronic documents are rendered by use of a font file, which is a typically a bitmapped rendering of an alphanumeric character set. A transmitted file, by way of example, includes ASCII characters. In this example, a numeric value indicates one of 256 possible characters. A printer engine, such as a controller, associates each character with a bitmapped font character, and transfers bitmapped characters to the print medium. Bitmapped fonts are typically shipped with printers, and suitably embedded in printer firmware. A character-based document sent for printing includes a selection of one or more of the embedded printer fonts, and a document is rendered accordingly. If additional fonts are needed, a user must wait for a printer upgrade, such as via a firmware flash of printer-specific font data to include the additional font, prior to use. Alternatively, font data can be rasterized by a workstation and communicated, along with a print job, for use with that job. It will be appreciated that this places added burden on the workstation, as well as increases network data traffic by resending the font data each time a job requires it.

A variant to the forgoing system is evidenced by the cited Salgado patent. That system employs a workstation that senses a printer's font capabilities, converts a font to a type used by the particular printer, and then downloads the converted font to the printer for future use. While this may offer some advantages over earlier systems, it nonetheless requires a dedicated operation wherein a remote station must sense a printer's capabilities, convert a font, and then transmit the converted font.

The subject application teaches an improvement over Salgado such that the controller of the printer, itself, is enabled to accept fonts of various formats. The printer itself senses a type of code, and appends sufficient intelligence to allow for rasterization. Finally, using this engrafted intelligence, which is determined and applied on a basis of what was received, the printer itself rasterizes the font and makes it available for current and future use. Thus, no operation need determine printer capabilities in advance, nor is there a need to feed a printer a font that has already been converted to a supported format.

Amendment to each of independent claims 1, 13, 16 and 28 has been made to further emphasize the patentable distinctions over the art of record. By virtue of such amendment, all claims include limitations wherein fonts for multiple formats, such as PostScript, PCL or other type, is sent to a printer controller, without being formatted for that printer. The printer controller determines a font type, and appends information to the font to allow it to be converted to a format understood by the printer in a stored, rasterized format. A management font file upload need not be concerned with a printer capability or font file format. In the event that the font file is not understood by the controller, an error message is generated. This is far removed from the structured, printer-sensitive font conversion and push taught by Salgado

The deficiencies in the teachings of Salgado relative to the amended claims are not remedied by any additional teachings of Tai, which is sited as teaching document encoding. The deficiencies are further lacking from the teachings of McQueen, cited as teaching font management.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art, and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

66329:31274\998089.1

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/31274.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: *e - 23 - 08*

Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009